

### **REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the in-person interview on July 23, 2008. Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64, and 71-72 remain pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. The remaining independent claims are claim 1, reciting a computer program, and claim 37, reciting a corresponding method. Independent claims 1 and 37 have been amended based on the discussions during the interview, and additionally in view of the Examiner's comments in the Interview Summary dated July 28, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments and following remarks.

#### **I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

##### ***A. Overview of the Inventive Concept***

As demonstrated during the interview, the claimed invention provides a unique system and method for generating and navigating a workspace for a computer application. Aspects of the invention may be readily explained by reference, for example, to figure 3 of the application and its associated description at paragraphs [0039-0047].

An "application workspace" 54 is generated for a computer application. The application workspace may be thought of as the entire virtual area over which application content may be present. Thus, this "logical" application workspace is not the same as what may be viewed on a physical display monitor at any one time. Indeed, as depicted in figure 3, and as set forth in claims 1 and 37, the application workspace 54 is larger than the physical display area used to display a physically viewable work area and is larger than that physical display. In figure 3, for example, a viewable area 55 is represented by the area within the frame 46, which, in the illustrated exemplary embodiment, may be made up of a title bar, menu bar, tool bar, scroll bars, and/or task bars.

The application workspace 54 is made up of a plurality of logical screens 56. In the example of figure 3, sixteen screens 56a-p are arranged in a 4 x 4 matrix, although other configurations may be employed.

As explained during the interview, the term “screen,” as used in the application, should not be confused with a physical display monitor or a computer desktop. Rather, the term “screen,” as used in the application, denotes a unit component of the application workspace where each screen has measurements corresponding to the viewable work area. As further explained below, the other screens, though not being viewed, are active and may contain application content.

The screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous workspace. A given screen may contain sub-application windows 58 containing application content. For example, the viewed screen 56f from figure 3 has three open sub-application windows 58a, 58b, and 58c, while non-viewed screen 56k contains two open sub-application windows 58g and 58h. Note that at a given time, a screen may be empty and thus not contain any application content. (See, e.g., screens 56m-p.) In addition, a sub-application window may straddle screen boundaries, as does sub-application window 58d.

The non-viewed logical screens are an active component of the workspace. For example, suppose in figure 3 sub-application window 58g in non-viewed screen 56k is a portion of the application that updates a database based on a continuous data stream. The sub-application continues its updating function even though a user may be looking at screen 56f. In addition, because the screens are arranged contiguously to create a single and functionally continuous virtual workspace, the spatial relationships of the sub-application windows are maintained. For example, in figure 3, a user may navigate from screen 56f down one screen and to the right one screen (such as with scroll bars or the below-described navigation tool) to view the sub-application windows 58g and 58h in screen 56k.

In view of these features, independent program claim 1 has been amended to recite a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a

computer-readable medium. The tool comprises code that includes the following features: (1) it generates a logical application workspace larger than a viewable work area defined by an associated main computer application and larger than a monitor used to display the viewable work area; (2) the logical application workspace is comprised of a plurality of logical screens that are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous workspace; and (3) each screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable area defined by the main computer application. Comparable features are recited in independent method claim 37.

As further explained below, neither of the references cited by the Examiner discloses these features. Rather, the references are only about ways to arrange content ***within the physically viewable area*** defined by a display monitor. As such, neither reference discloses or suggests an application workspace ***larger than a physically viewable work area*** defined by an associated main computer application. It necessarily follows that the references similarly do not disclose an application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens that are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is ***a single and functionally continuous logical workspace***, and that ***each screen*** has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application.

As demonstrated during the interview, additional aspects of the invention include various generation and navigation features. For example, the number of screens, and thus the dimensions of the workspace, may be expanded by virtue of a user action. In one embodiment, the number of screens and workspace dimensions may be altered by user movement of a sub-application window. If a sub-application window is dragged or otherwise moved beyond the current dimensions of the workspace, the number of screens and workspace dimensions expand. (See, e.g., Application at paragraphs [0050-0054] and figure 4.) Various manipulations of the workspace dimensions are recited, for example, in program claims 3, 4, and 16, and 17, and in corresponding method claims 39, 40, 52, and 53.

Other features demonstrated during the interview include the various navigation mechanisms. One such exemplary navigation mechanism is the navigation box 84. The navigation box 84 (figure 7) represents a miniaturized version of the logical application workspace 54, including miniaturized representations of the plurality of screens 56. Each sub-application window 58 may also be represented in the navigation box in a miniaturized iconic, text, or similar form. The navigation box may be used for a variety of navigation operations including, for example, selecting a screen to view, selecting a sub-application to view, moving sub-applications around the workspace or among the screens, and others. The navigation mechanisms may also include drop down menus for performing comparable operations. (See, e.g., Application at paragraphs [0058-0066] and figures 6-8.) Various navigation mechanisms are recited, for example, in program claims 18-25 and in corresponding method claims 54-61.

As further explained below, none of these features are disclosed in the references cited by the Examiner.

***B. Rejections Based On Czerwinski***

Of the remaining pending claims, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12, 13, 18-24, 35-38, 42-45, 48, 49, 54-60, and 71-72 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0066414 (Czerwinski).

At the outset, Applicant notes that the claimed features that the screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace have been incorporated into independent claim 1 based on features recited in original claim 15 (now canceled). Similarly, these features have been incorporated into independent claim 37 based on features recited in original claim 51 (now canceled). The Examiner does not cite Czerwinski against either original claim 15 or claim 51. Accordingly, the Examiner has implicitly recognized that Czerwinski does not anticipate amended claims 1 and 37 (and therefore all the dependent claims). For this reason alone, the rejections based on Czerwinski should be withdrawn.

In addition, the system of Czerwinski bears little resemblance to the claimed invention. Czerwinski deals with managing windows within the physically viewable area or display using the operating system desktop and the taskbar. Czerwinski does not disclose or suggest generating a logical workspace **larger than a viewable work area** defined by an associated main computer application. This teaching deficiency of Czerwinski is apparent throughout its disclosure. For example, Czerwinski refers to representing “graphical windows in the desktop and as a control tile in the taskbar.” (Paragraph [0007].) Similarly, Czerwinski discloses representing “graphical windows in a first portion of the display and as graphic controls on a second portion of the display.” (Paragraph [0008].) Indeed, throughout Czerwinski discusses apportioning a display having a desktop portion and a taskbar. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0035-0036] and figure 1.) After disclosing these general features, the remainder of Czerwinski is geared toward disclosing various specific ways grouping control tiles and/or representing them on the taskbar. Czerwinski does not disclose or suggest generating an application workspace larger than a viewable work area, and thus it follows that Czerwinski does not disclose or suggest the other claimed features.

As representative of the Examiner’s rejections, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0003], [0008], [0024], and [0035] of Czerwinski against independent claims 1 and 37. Paragraph [0003] is part of the background section, and states that a program “is represented as one or more graphic windows **on the display area.**” (Emphasis added.) Similarly, as quoted above, paragraph [0008] refers to the representation of graphical windows on first and second portions “of the display”. These paragraphs, therefore, relate only to a physically viewable area. Paragraph [0024] describes an exemplary computing environment, but does not relate to the graphical user interface at all. None of these passages, therefore, discloses forming a logical workspace larger than a physically viewable work area including a plurality of logical screens.

Similarly, paragraph [0035] of Czerwinski describes the graphical user interface as depicted in figure 1. The graphic user interface includes a first display area 102 “commonly referred to as a desktop”. The graphical user interface also includes a second display area 114, “commonly referred to as a taskbar”. Any frequent user of the

Windows® operating system is no doubt familiar with the desktop and the taskbar. Both of these features, however, are portions of a physically viewable area of the display. Czerwinski does not disclose a logical application workspace that includes functional area existing beyond the physically viewable work area.

The Examiner may be citing to paragraph [0035] of Czerwinski because of its use of the term “screens”. Czerwinski states that “the desktop portion of the display may be embodied in multiple display screens 102.” This simply means that the desktop 102 may be divided into a variety of windows, as seen in figure 1. The referenced screens of Czerwinski are all within the physically viewable area of the display. As stated above, however, the term “screen” as used in the current application differs, and denotes a unit of measurement for identifying components of the workspace, including the workspace’s virtual components outside of the physically viewable area. Once one recognizes the distinction between the use of the term “screens” in the current application versus Czerwinski, the distinctions between Czerwinski and the claimed invention become readily apparent. Czerwinski does not relate to, disclose, or suggest generating a navigable logical application workspace beyond the physically viewable work area.

Because Czerwinski does not disclose or suggest generating a logical application workspace larger than a physically viewable work area defined by an associated main computer application, it follows that Czerwinski does not disclose other features recited in the independent claims. For example, Czerwinski does not disclose a logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens that are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace. Czerwinski also does not disclose that each screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable area defined by the main computer application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Czerwinski does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 37, and therefore does not anticipate any of the dependent claims for at least the same reasons. More specifically, having not disclosed the features of the independent claims, Czerwinski certainly does not disclose the specific features recited

in the dependent claims, including, for example, the ways of altering the dimensions of the logical workspace, or the navigation mechanisms, described in the previous section.

Accordingly, the rejections based on Czerwinski should be withdrawn.

### **C. Rejections Based On Anderson**

Of the remaining pending claims, claims 1-5, 10, 14, 16-17, 25-28, 37-41, 46, 50, 52-53, and 61-64 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189597 (Anderson).

Similar to Czerwinski, Anderson discloses a system for displaying information within a physically viewable area. Anderson does not disclose or suggest generating a logical workspace for a main computer application where the logical workspace is **larger than a physically viewable work area** defined by that associated main computer application.

Rather, Anderson discloses displaying multiple desktops on a single display. Each desktop is displayed as a scaled pane having dimensions proportional to, but less than, the dimensions of a non-scaled desktop. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0008], [0034], [0037], figures 5-7.)

As representative of the Examiner's rejections, the Examiner cites the abstract, paragraphs [0003] and [0008-0009], and figures 2 and 5 of Anderson against independent claims 1 and 37. In addition, the Examiner cites paragraph [0040] and figure 7 against original claims 15 and 51, whose features are now incorporated into claims 1 and 37 respectively.

The abstract, paragraphs [0008-0009], and figure 5 merely describe the basic features of Anderson stated above – the display of multiple desktops, where each desktop is scaled so that all of the desktops fit on a single physical display area. These features bear little resemblance to the claimed invention. Figure 7 and paragraph [0040] relate to an embodiment of the scaled desktops in which each taskbar only contains task buttons for its associated desktop. As pertaining to the claimed invention,

therefore, figure 7 and paragraph [0040] do not warrant a different analysis from the other passages cited by the Examiner. These paragraphs, therefore, relate only to a physically viewable area on a display, and not the expansive logical workspace of the claimed invention. Figure 2 depicts a generic computing device, but does not depict the specific features of the graphical user interface at all.

In the Interview Summary dated July 28, 2008, the Examiner further explains his rejections based on Anderson. The Interview Summary references a proposed amended claim 1 that, among other features, would have incorporated the features of original claim 15. The Interview Summary states:

Examiner interprets Anderson Figure 7 to illustrate a workspace comprising of four screens. Examiner also interprets the application window to be the viewable area as recited in the proposed claim. Therefore, the four screens together (i.e. workspace) are contiguously arranged [sic- and] are larger than the application window (e.g. Ref.# 344B). The application window (i.e. viewable area) when maximized within a screen is generally coextensive with that screen dimensions.

In the Examiner's interpretation, each scaled desktop constitutes a "screen" that consumes about a quarter of the viewable area of the physical monitor. But this is not comparable to the Applicant's use of the term screen, where each logical screen unit is the size of a physically viewable work area defined by a main computer application.

Moreover, the purported screens in Anderson, each being a separate desktop, do not form a single and functionally continuous workspace as claimed. Each desktop is independent of all the others. For example, if a user were to drag an application window to the edge of one of Anderson's purported screens (scaled desktop), the window would disappear from the scaled desktop in the same way as when only one full size desktop is displayed. The application window could not be dragged to an adjacent desktop; nor could an application window straddle two desktops. (In contrast, see, e.g., figure 3 of the Application, element 58d.) Also, if an Anderson "screen" (desktop) were maximized, it would not be larger than the display used to display the desktop.



As should be readily apparent, Anderson simply discloses tiling distinct desktops, but those desktops are each independent of each other and do not form a single, continuous logical workspace. It follows that Anderson does not disclose that the logical application workspace, as a whole, is larger than a scaled or maximized desktop or that the logical application workspace, as a whole, is larger than the monitor used to display such a desktop.

In view of the Examiner's comments in the Interview Summary, amended claims 1 and 37 as submitted herein recite that a plurality of logical screens are arranged contiguously such that the logical application workspace is a ***single and functionally continuous*** workspace. The feature that the screens form a single and functionally continuous workspace clarifies the distinctions between the claimed invention and Anderson's displaying of scaled independent desktops, each being smaller than a physical display.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Anderson does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 37, and therefore does not anticipate any of the dependent claims for at least the same reasons. In addition, because the scaled desktops of Anderson do not form a single and functionally continuous logical workspace, Anderson also does not disclose or suggest the specific features recited in certain dependent claims, including, for example, the ways of altering the dimensions of the workspace, or the navigation mechanisms, described in Section A above. For example, one cannot expand or contract the workspace by moving application windows. In addition, Anderson does not disclose a navigation box that represents the workspace, from which screens and/or application windows may be selected and manipulated.

Accordingly, the rejections based on Anderson should be withdrawn.

## **II. CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64, and 71-72 recite patentable subject matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the

present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to resolve any outstanding issues.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988, our Order No. CUTCP0103US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /MDavidGalin/  
M. David Galin; Reg. No. 41,767

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
Telephone: (216) 621-1113  
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165